



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MARYLAND'S ADOPTION OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

I.

THE importance of Maryland's action in ratifying the Federal Constitution was fully appreciated at the time. Six states had already approved of the new form of government, when Maryland's convention met in April, 1788. The result was in grave doubt in South Carolina, Virginia and New York. New Hampshire's convention had adjourned, without taking final action. North Carolina and Rhode Island were avowedly opposed to changing to the new system. If Maryland refused to ratify, or if her convention adjourned without final action, the forces of Anti-Federalism in the doubtful states would be greatly encouraged and might even win the day. The people of Maryland felt that the eyes of all were on her, and aware of the importance of her course of action, ratified at once and by a decided vote.¹ Maryland had not been a state strongly inclined towards the Articles of Confederation and had held them back for two years, till she had become assured that the western lands would be used for the good of all. There had been full opportunity for discussion, and the well-informed people of the state did not disappoint those who watched anxiously for the decision. Madison wrote to Jefferson² on February 19, 1788, that "it is currently said Maryland will be one of the ratifying states. Mr. Chase and a few others will raise a considerable opposition. . . . But the weight of personal influence is on the side of the Constitution, and the present expectation is that the opposition will be outnumbered by a great majority." Two months later, on April 10, he wrote to Washington:³ "The difference between even a postponement and adoption in Maryland may, in the nice balance of parties here (in Virginia), possibly give a fatal advantage to that which opposes the Constitution."

Washington had been hopeful of Maryland's action from the first. As early as November 5, 1787, he wrote Madison:⁴ "So far as

¹ G. T. Curtis, *Const. Hist.*, 2d ed., I. 657.

² *Madison Papers*, I. 378.

³ *Madison Papers*, I. 384.

⁴ *Writings*, XI. 182 (Ford's edition). January 1, 1788, writing to Jefferson, he says he still thinks Maryland will ratify. *Writings*, XI. 202.

the sentiments of Maryland, with respect to the proposed Constitution, have come to my knowledge, they are strongly in favor of it. . . . Mr. Carroll, of Carrollton, and Mr. Thomas Johnson are declared friends of it." But he was keen to see danger from Maryland's wavering, and on the eve of the convention wrote Johnson¹ "that an adjournment, if attempted, of your convention to a later period than the decision of the question in this State (Virginia), will be tantamount to a rejection of the Constitution. I have good reasons for this opinion, and am told it is the blow, which the leading characters of the opposition in the next State have meditated, if it shall be found that a direct attack is not likely to succeed in yours. If this be true, it cannot be too much deprecated and guarded against." The postponement in New Hampshire had a bad effect on Virginia. "An event similar to this in Maryland would have the worst tendency imaginable; for undecision there would certainly have considerable influence upon South Carolina, the only other State which is to precede Virginia, and submits the question almost wholly to the determination of the latter."

When Maryland had decided firmly for the Constitution, Washington's last doubt as to its success was removed. He wrote Gouverneur Morris² of the situation in Virginia: "I have not at any moment despaired of this State's acceptance of the new Constitution, since the ratification of Maryland by so large and decided a majority." To Benjamin Lincoln³ he expressed the opinion that Maryland's decision would tend to fix in favor of the Constitution many before undecided and even reluctant delegates who depended on Maryland's decision to confirm their opinion. It has been "strongly insisted upon by the opponents in the lower and back counties," in Virginia, that "Maryland would reject it by a large majority," but this claim had proven false. In his joy, Washington⁴ said to Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer: "Seven affirmative without a negative would almost convert the unerring (*sic*) sister. The fiat of your convention will most assuredly raise the edifice." With Maryland came to the support of the new frame of government a majority of the thirteen states and a great majority of their free inhabitants.

Despite the importance of this portion of Maryland's history, its narrative has never been fully told and has been frequently misunderstood.⁵ We will now attempt to give as complete an account as we may from the available sources.

¹ *Writings*, XI. 244.

² *Writings*, XI. 240, May 2, 1788.

³ *Writings*, XI. 261.

⁴ April 27, 1788. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Const.*, II. 284.

⁵ Vide Miss Rowland's *Carroll of Carrollton*.

Maryland had strong Federal and national leanings. Though she had been last of the states to accept the Articles of Confederation, her delay had really been in the interest of a true national spirit. She voted cheerfully to comply with the Act of Congress of April 18, 1783, and voted to grant the five per cent. duty asked for, in case eleven other states should do the same. She also voted to grant ten shillings on every £100 of property for twenty-five years, as her proportion of the internal fund required by Congress.

We all remember the memorable meeting of the commissioners from Maryland and Virginia at Mt. Vernon, and their deliberations over the respective rights of the two states in the waters of the Potomac and Chesapeake.

The fact is also well known that the state of Maryland was not represented at the meeting of commissioners from all the states at Annapolis in 1786. This fact is often mentioned to Maryland's discredit, as if due to a lack of national spirit or to quarrelling factions in her legislature, but there is another possible view which should not be overlooked. On March 13, 1786, Daniel Carroll,¹ a strong Federalist, wrote a private letter to James Madison, in which he attributed the failure to appoint delegates to an over-caution in behalf of the Union, rather than to disinclination towards a more perfect one. The General Assembly was about to adjourn after a session of four months, when the proposition from the Virginia Assembly for a meeting of commissioners to adjust a general commercial system reached Annapolis. The House of Delegates proposed to elect commissioners, but the Senate feared that the measure would "have a tendency to weaken the authority of Congress on which the *Union* and, consequently, the Liberty and Safety of all the States depends."

They recognized that the measure was adopted by the Virginia Assembly with the best intentions, but they had "just received the Act of Congress of the 15th of February last, by which it appears that Body relies *solely* on the States complying with the Act of the 18th of April, 1783," and they feared that "the idea of commissioners, meeting from all the States on the regulation of Trade, will retard the Act of Congress from being carried into execution, if not entirely destroy it." These timorous Union men thought that "the reluctant States" would be "very willing to lay hold of any thing which will procrastinate that measure," and that "sound policy, if not the spirit of the Confederation, dictates that all matters of a general tendency should be [considered?] in the representative Body of the whole, or under its authority." These views help to show

¹ Carroll's letters are among the Madison Papers in the Department of State.

us why the Federalists were so careful to gain the formal sanction of Congress for every step they took.

At the winter session of 1786, the General Assembly received a letter from the governor of Virginia,¹ dated December 1, suggesting that a convention for amending the Articles of Confederation be held at Philadelphia in the next May. The House of Delegates, on December 21, considered the letter and voted in favor of choosing seven deputies by joint ballot of two houses. The Senate, on the same day, cheerfully acceded to this proposition, and asked for a joint conference, as the subject required the united wisdom of the legislature. They say: "This measure appears to us to be of the utmost importance and most likely, with the least delay, to vest in federal government those powers, which are so necessary to give strength and stability to the union. As the deputies must be clothed with ample authority, we think it would be proper previously to their appointment to determine in a conference of both houses the nature and extent of their power."

The House of Delegates appointed Thomas Johnson, John H. Stone, Samuel Chase, William Paca and Robert Wright on the committee and they met Thomas Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton and William Hemsley from the Senate. On January 1, 1787, the conferees reported as follows: "It is agreed that the deputies appointed by this State, or any three or more of them, be authorised on behalf of this State to meet such deputies as may be appointed and authorised by the other States to assemble in convention at Philadelphia, for the purpose of revising the federal system, and to join with them in considering such alterations and further provisions, as may be necessary to render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigences of the union, and, in reporting such an act for that purpose to the United States in Congress as, when agreed to by them and fully confirmed by the several States, will effectually provide for the same;" and "that the proceedings of the deputies, and any act agreed to in the said convention, be reported by the deputies to the next session of Assembly."² No delegates seem to have been chosen until April, when R. Hanson Harrison, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Thomas Stone, James McHenry and Thomas Sim Lee were chosen. As four of these did not accept the position, Luther Martin, John Francis Mercer, Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer and Daniel Carroll were chosen to fill vacancies on May 22. Three days later the Assembly voted to pay them, as delegates in Congress were paid.

¹ *Md. Gazette*, February 22, 1787.

² The act as finally passed on May 26, 1787, is printed in *Documentary History of the Constitution*, I. 25, 26. Only McHenry accepted, of the list first elected.

While the Convention was meeting in Philadelphia, considerable interest began to be shown in the matter in Maryland. There were three newspapers in the state: one in Annapolis and two in Baltimore town. The former, the *Gazette*, paid but little attention to national politics and was much more concerned with a controversy between Gabriel Duval, Jenifer, and Stone over the management of the intendant's office, or with the refusal of the Senate to pass the truck bill. It does inform us¹ that, in April 1787, the grand jury of St. Mary's County said in its report that: "A cheerful co-operation with our sister States at the ensuing Federal Convention will restore public credit and give the United States of America a rank and consequence in Europe that will be admired by all such as have witnessed the past exertions of patriotism and virtue which so eminently distinguished our glorious revolution." But such bits of information are rare in its sober and quiet columns. The general tone of its few references to such matters is Federalist, though it is worried by the secrecy of the Convention.² It reprints James Wilson's great speech at Philadelphia and has a letter from "A Federalist," suggesting that there is danger that the people will elect uneducated men to the ratifying convention and that it would be better to have the Senate, or a body of electors, appoint the members.³ The Baltimore papers, the *Maryland Journal* and the *Maryland Gazette and Baltimore Advertiser*, are filled with articles on the question. Both papers seemed to lean to the Federalist side, though they printed articles on both sides most impartially. The amount of space given to the subject is extraordinary and the number of articles reprinted from journals in other states shows that there is an intention to give the people the best arguments that can anywhere be found. Often we find a series of articles occupying one entire side of the paper and continued through five or six numbers. The *Maryland Journal* begins reprinting⁴ articles on the question as early as April 1787, but original articles from the pen of "Publicola," "Aristides," "Caution," and other local worthies do not appear before the summer. With true journalistic enterprise, the text of the proposed constitution, in its entirety, is given to the readers and occasional new items appear, as to the progress of ratification⁵ in the other states. As early as July, Federalist writers are suggesting that the Confederation was merely a tent and that what was wanted in the new Constitution was a castle of durable materials.⁶

¹ *Md. Gazette*, April 26, 1787.

² *Md. Gazette*, July 5, 1787.

³ *Md. Gazette*, October 4, 9, 11, 25, November 8, 22, 1787.

⁴ *Md. Journal*, April 17, June 5, September, 1787.

⁵ *Md. Journal*, September 25, June 15, October 2, 1787. The *Gazette* (Baltimore) prints Paterson's New Jersey resolves on February 15, 1788.

⁶ *Md. Journal*, July 3, 1787.

The autumn election for members of the legislature drew near and the Federalists felt that a set of men should be chosen favorable to calling a state convention. Samuel Chase was a candidate for the legislature from Baltimore town and it had been charged that he said a convention was in every respect improper.¹ The day after the charge was made, Chase delivered an address to a "numerous and respectable body of citizens" at the court-house.² In this, he said that the proposed Constitution of the United States would modify the constitution of Maryland and hence the legislature must act on it in the same way as on any other constitutional amendment, namely, by passing the measure at two successive sessions. He asserted that he was not opposed to the Union, but had always maintained the necessity of it and "the increase of powers in Congress." "I think," he said, "the federal government must be greatly altered. I have not formed my opinion, whether the plan proposed ought to be accepted, as it stands, without any amendment or alteration. The subject is very momentous and involves the greatest consequences. If elected, I will vote for and use my endeavors to procure a recommendation by the Legislature to call a convention, as soon as it can conveniently be done, unless otherwise directed by this town." The next day, he sent a note to the journal, stating that he meant to advocate the call of a convention "to consider and decide upon the Constitution proposed by the late Convention for the United States and to appoint the election of delegates to the Convention, as soon as the convenience of the people will permit. I further beg leave to add as my opinion, that the election of delegates to the Convention ought to be as early in the spring as may be."³

Chase had the largest vote cast in Baltimore town in the week following and he and his associates polled three-fourths of the votes cast. As Baltimore town was strongly in favor of the Constitution, there is no doubt that his letter and speech had much to do with his majority.⁴ His influence was great in the state and, in the previous decade, had done much towards inducing Maryland to declare her independence. He used that influence in a measure against the Constitution. On October 11 the *Journal* published an open letter⁵ written by him and signed "Caution." It was addressed to the

¹ *Md. Journal*, September 25, 1787.

² *Md. Journal*, September 28, 1787. Ford, *Essays on the Constitution*, p. 325. *Md. Gazette* (Baltimore), September 28. There was no submission to the people of amendments to the Maryland Constitution of 1776.

³ *Md. Journal*, October 5, 1787.

⁴ D. Carroll's letter to J. Madison, October 28, 1787.

⁵ Ford, *Essays on the Constitution*, p. 327. Reprinted in the *Md. Gazette* (Baltimore) of October 16.

"Inhabitants of Baltimore Town" and informed them that "an attempt to surprise you into any public measure ought to meet your indignation and contempt." After this rather mysterious statement, he went on to tell the citizens that "determinations that involve the future felicity of a whole people ought not to be taken before the most mature and deliberate consideration and a free and full examination of the subject and all its consequences." There had been a petition circulated, urging the legislature to call a ratifying convention, and "Caution" opposes this, if coupled with "your entire approbation of the New Federal Constitution and your desire that it should be adopted and confirmed by this State, as it now stands, without any amendment or alteration." We see here the beginning of that policy of conditional ratification, on which the Anti-Federalists will insist. Chase tells the people that this petition intends to "draw you into a declaration in favor of the whole system and to bind you hereafter to support it, which you must do, or allege deception or surprise." There will be a convention called without the petition and opinion should be held in abeyance concerning this Constitution. There will be at least three months before the need for a decision. Both sides should be heard in so momentous a question and the motives of any who advise haste may be suspected.

Chase had been in favor of the truck bill, which was one of the many anti-creditor movements of the day,¹ and it had already been charged that he was against the new government because its establishment would leave him and his adherents in irrecoverable ruin. The letter signed "Caution" seemed to some to prove that Chase was insincere. "A Friend to the Constitution," who probably was Daniel Carroll, answered him in the *Journal*² for October 16. This letter states that the convention to be called will be one to ratify, not one to "propose amendments or alterations." It urges the signing of the petition,³ that the legislature may "have the authority of the largest and most promising and manufacturing town in the State to countenance so important a recommendation." The petition is proper, because the Constitution does meet the approbation of the people and because what is needed is to have a convention called "to confirm and ratify." The petition is "necessary at this time, because wanted as an inducement to the legislature to call upon the people to appoint" such a convention. Baltimore is so peculiarly interested in the speedy adoption of the Constitution, that there should be no opposition there.

¹ *Md. Gazette* (Baltimore), September 28, 1787.

² Ford, *Essays on the Constitution*, p. 331.

³ The petition was presented to the House of Delegates on December 1.

During October and November we find numerous articles¹ in the Baltimore papers. In addition to attacks on the Constitution by "Democratic Federalist" and "Centinel," and defenses by "Uncus" and a "Friend to Order," we have a local controversy as to whether Chase and McMechen, the town's delegates, should be instructed to vote for a convention, or left to their discretion in the matter.

Intense interest was manifested in the result in other states. When the Assembly met and summoned the delegates to the Philadelphia Convention before it the Federalists praised warmly Dr. McHenry's speech, while the *Gazette*, with great journalistic enterprise, printed the full text of Martin's argument, running it through several numbers. Daniel Carroll had written to Madison on October 28 that all was going well, and his opinion seems to have been correct, though he made a mistaken prophecy about Chase, thinking that if he was chosen to a convention, he would be "bound to vote to ratify the proposed foederal government, the impression in Baltimore being strong and general in favor of it."

As soon as it was determined that a convention would be called there was discussion as to who should compose it. "A Marylander"² writes on the importance of choosing the proper men. The convention should be made impartial, by rejecting salaried officers, senators, assembly-men, and considerable holders of public certificates, that a majority of the members may not be reproached with having consulted pecuniary interests, or the preservation of personal influence more than public good. It was asserted by "many red-hot Whigs" that the Tories and non-jurors were in favor of the Constitution from an aversion to republican government, and, therefore, no non-juror should be chosen "unless generally admitted as uncommonly well versed in the principles of government." Party violence should be avoided; the majority of the people should remember that they are "too enveloped in their occupations to analyze the complicated form of government."

In the legislature, the Senate had received a message on November 24 from the governor concerning the Federal Convention. The message was referred to a committee composed of George

¹ *Journal*: "Centinel," October 30, November 2, November 6; "Federalist," November 9, 30; "Uncus," December 7; "Member of House of Delegates," December 21; reprint of R. H. Lee's and Geo. Mason's Anti-Federal arguments, December 25. *Gazette*: "American Citizen," and reprints of Federal arguments from Oswald's *Independent Gazetteer* in October 5, 9, 12, November 2; "Democratic Federalist," October 26; "Watchman," October 30; "Friend to Order," October 30; "Old Whig," November 2; Anonymous, November 6, 16; "Old Man," November 20.

² *Gazette*, December 4, 1787.

Gale, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, John Hall, and Daniel Carroll. Two days later, they reported in favor of holding a convention in March next, for the "assent and ratification" of the proposed Constitution. The resolutions in full are as follows :

"Whereas the deputies lately appointed by the several State Legislatures to meet in convention at Philadelphia, for the purpose of revising the federal system and considering of such alterations and provisions as might be necessary to render the federal constitution adequate to the exigencies of the Union, have reported a constitution for the future government of the United States, which, by an unanimous resolve of Congress, has been transmitted to the legislature of this State, in order to be submitted to a convention of delegates chosen by the people, and this legislature, approving of the opinion of the said convention, that the proposed constitution shall be submitted to a convention of the people chosen in each State by the people thereof, for their assent and ratification,

"Therefore, Resolved that it be recommended to the people of this State to submit the constitution, proposed by the said federal convention to a convention of delegates, for their assent and ratification.

"Resolved: that it be recommended to each county, city, and town in this State to elect the same number of delegates to serve in convention that they are represented by in the most numerous branch of the legislature.

"Resolved: that the qualifications of delegates to the convention and their electors, as to age, residence, and property be respectively the same with those required by the law and constitution of this State for members of the House of Delegates.

"Resolved, that the election of delegates be holden the third Wednesday of January next, at the several places fixed by law for holding the elections for delegates in the General Assembly, and that it be conducted by the same officers, in the same manner, and in the same time.

"Resolved, that the sheriffs and other returning officers in the counties give public notice, by advertisement fifteen days before the election, of the time and purposes for which the election is to be held.

"Resolved, that the delegates so chosen meet at the city of Annapolis on the first Monday in March next and if they assent and ratify the proposed Constitution, that they give notice thereof to the United States in Congress assembled."

On the next day the House of Delegates adopted a different series of resolutions, calling a "convention of the people for their full and free investigation and decision." Their resolutions are less strongly Federal in tone and show the influence of Chase and his friends. They postponed the date of the convention until April 21, which postponement was regarded as unfriendly to the Constitution. The House resolves in full were as follows :¹

"Resolved, that it be recommended to the people of this State to submit the proceedings of the federal convention, transmitted to the General Assembly through the medium of Congress, to a convention of the people for their full and free investigation and decision.

¹ *Gazette*, December 6, 1787.

“Resolved, that it be recommended to such of the inhabitants of this State as are entitled to vote for delegates in the General Assembly, to meet in their respective counties, the city of Annapolis, and Baltimore town, on the first Monday in April next, at the several places fixed by law for holding the annual elections, to choose four persons for each county, two for the city of Annapolis and two for Baltimore town, to serve in the State convention for the purpose of taking under consideration the proposed plan of government of the United States and that the said elections be conducted agreeably to the mode and conformably with the general rules and regulations prescribed for electing members to serve in the House of Delegates.

“Resolved, that the delegates to be elected to serve in the State Convention shall, at the time of election, be citizens of the State and actually residing therein for three years next preceding the election, residents of the county where they shall be elected twelve months next preceding the convention, and be twenty-one years of age.

“Resolved, that the sheriffs of the respective counties, the mayor, recorder and aldermen or any three of them in the city of Annapolis, and the commissioners of Baltimore town, or any three of them, shall and they are hereby required to give immediate notice by advertisement to the people of the counties, city of Annapolis, and Baltimore town, of the time, place, and purpose of the elections as aforesaid.

“Resolved, that the persons so elected to serve in the said convention do assemble on Monday the twenty-first day of April next at the city of Annapolis and may adjourn from day to day, as occasion may require, and that the same delegates, so assembled, do then and there take into consideration the aforesaid constitution and, if approved of by them or a majority of them, finally to ratify the same, in behalf and on the part of this State and make reports thereof to the United States in Congress assembled.

“Resolved, that the delegates to be elected for Baltimore be residents of the said town and the delegates to be elected for Baltimore County be residents of the said county out of the limits of Baltimore town.”

These resolves had been introduced by Mr. Key on the 24th, and had been carried by small majorities, the vote on the postponement of the convention being 24 to 23, and that for inserting the words “a majority of them,” so that the convention need not be unanimous in its approval of the Constitution, being 28 to 21. On December 1, the Senate agreed to the House resolutions, so as not to prolong the session, and an adjournment followed the next week. It was determined to print two thousand copies of the proceedings of the Federal Convention and resolves of the Assembly and to send them throughout the State, while three hundred copies of a German translation should be made by the printer in Frederick town and distributed through Frederick, Washington and Baltimore Counties.

On November 23 the House, by a vote of 28 to 22, decided to ask the delegates to Philadelphia to come before it on the 29th and report on their work. Mercer did not come, but the other four were present and spoke. We have no report of the speeches of the

three Federalist delegates, but Luther Martin, the only Anti-Federalist, has left us a complete record.¹ He regretted the secrecy of the Convention, as it prevented him from corresponding with friends about the proposed features. He felt that it was the object of Virginia and the other large states to increase their power by the new Constitution. He gave an account of the proceedings and criticized the Convention's work severely, charging Washington and Franklin with advocating the Constitution because of the increased power given to Virginia, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. The Federalists laughed at this story of a conspiracy founded by those two statesmen "to subvert the liberties of the United States." The *Maryland Gazette and Baltimore Advertiser*, which had printed Martin's address, prints attacks on it by "A Federalist"² and "An American,"³ and reprints Dickinson's *New Roof*.⁴ The conduct of Pennsylvania is closely watched and praised or blamed, as the writers are Federalists or not.⁵ The approval by Connecticut encourages the former party,⁶ and there is much interest in the attitude of Massachusetts.⁷ News comes of Georgia's ratification and wild rumors of a plot in New York to purchase the Anti-Federalists.⁸ Open letters addressed to prominent persons appear. "An American" writes to Richard Henry Lee to urge on him arguments in favor of the Constitution.

The *Gazette* prints the resolves introduced into the Federal Convention⁹ by Paterson of New Jersey and is criticized for not stating at the time, that Paterson finally signed the Constitution and was one of its supporters.¹⁰ The Annapolis paper arouses itself from its somnolence only once,¹¹ when "An Annopolitan" endeavors to convince the citizens of the ancient city that they will gain rather than lose by the adoption of the Federal Constitution. He thinks there is a majority for the Constitution in the state, but says that in

¹ *Gazette*, December 28, 1787; January 1, 4, 8, 11, 15, 18, 22, 29, 1788; February 1, 5, 8. The speech was said to have been taken down by a "Customer," but the Federalists (January 1, 1788) maintained that it was written out by Martin himself. See also January 29, for Martin's letter to Thomas Cockey Deye.

² January 11, 1788.

³ January 22, 1788.

⁴ January 15, 1788. In the same number is a brief note by "Caveto" on the dangers of arbitrary government; see also February 5.

⁵ Vide *Gazette*, January 4, 18, 22, 25, 29, February 1, 19, 1788.

⁶ *Gazette*, January 25, 29.

⁷ *Gazette*, January 18, 29, 1788.

⁸ February 5, 19, 1788.

⁹ *Gazette*, February 8, 12. February 8, Federal letter from Gentleman of Kentucky.

¹⁰ *Gazette*, February 15, 19.

¹¹ January 31, 1788.

every county there are men "exerting their whole power and putting every engine in motion to defeat, as they allege, the deep concerted scheme of a few aspiring, wealthy, and well born." He points out that the new government cannot become an aristocracy, because the people will control it. There will be left to Maryland the control of enough internal matters to take the time of the General Assembly and, as the federal government will probably establish a court at each state capital, there will be two courts at Annapolis. Nay, even the seat of the federal government may be placed there.

During these early months of 1788, the most important publication on the Federalist side is the pamphlet¹ written by the learned jurist, Alexander Contee Hanson, and published under the *nom de guerre* of "Aristides." He entitles it: "*Remarks on the Proposed Plan of Federal Government, Addressed to the Citizens of the United States of America and particularly to the People of Maryland.*" It is an octavo pamphlet, printed at Annapolis, and contains forty-two pages. It is dedicated to Washington and bears on its title-page the following quotation from Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws*: "As a confederate government is composed of petty republics, it enjoys the internal happiness of each; and with regard to its external situation, by means of the association, it possesses all the advantages of extensive monarchies." He discusses the three departments of government and defends the provisions of the Constitution with respect to them all. He takes the judiciary power in too narrow a sense, thinking there can be no appeal from a state court to a federal one. He shows that the pretension of North Carolina and Georgia to the West can now be tried in a federal court. The need of a bill of rights is denied.² A warm eulogy on the Convention and the plan of a confederated republic is given and this is favorably contrasted with a league and with jarring states. Under the Union, Maryland will gain foreign respect and will no longer be a "poor member of a defenceless system of petty republics." The plan of the new government is not for the rich, but it will be for all "the happiest form of government which the sun ever beheld." Many

¹ Advertised in *Maryland Gazette* for January 10 and 31, 1788, to be sold at 2/9 or 3/8 to cover cost of printing. Reprinted by P. L. Ford in *Pamphlets on the Constitution*, pp. 217 to 257.

² On this point "A Farmer" attacks him in *Maryland Gazette* (Baltimore) of February 15. In a letter to the *Maryland Journal* of April 22, "Aristides" asserts that Mr. Robert H. Hanson and Mr. Robert Goldsborough agree with him that the state and federal courts have concurrent jurisdiction, that Congress will determine in what civil cases a jury trial will be allowed, and that every judge may pass on the constitutionality of acts of Congress. He also denies that he is acting through personal ambition, as "Farmer" had declared.

of the foes to the Constitution are paper-money men, whose plans Maryland has just rejected. "Should Heaven in its wrath inflict blindness on the people of America," he cries, "should they reject this fair offer of permanent safety and happiness, to predict what species of government shall at last spring from disorder is beyond the short reach of political foresight." Noah Webster well said of the work, "These remarks are not at all original, but they are very judicious, calculated to remove objections to the proposed plan of government."

The work of the Federalists was so successful that, on February 10, Daniel Carroll wrote to Madison that the plan of the Anti-Federalists was no longer to try to have the proposed Constitution rejected by the convention, but to adjourn its sessions, till Virginia's convention has acted. They will probably fail in this, though some of their publications give strong proofs of a great degree of activity prevailing. On the other hand, Carroll thinks that a few of the federal publications said certain things concerning the conduct of individuals which might better have been omitted. They had been insisting that the Constitution be adopted "with all its faults," as it is "as little exceptionable as anything of the kind that ever came under" their notice. Their expectation was confident that amendments would be made in such parts as would require it.¹ Sentiments that the "new constitution is pregnant with despotism and even that it is dreadful to liberty" have been "chiefly propagated in Maryland by men, whose interests would be deeply affected by any change of government, especially for the better, and those, to whose embarrassed circumstances regularity and order would be exceedingly inconvenient." The independent electors were informed by "Civis" that the Federal Convention was an "august assembly, consisting of men of the most distinguished abilities, integrity," and virtue² and that it produced a "system universally admired by those of impartial political erudition and which, upon candid examination by the independent and well affected, is found to be fully calculated to promote the liberty, happiness, and prosperity of all the States in the Union." The papers now are filled with advice to electors, as to whom they should choose as delegates to the convention. They should avoid choosing members of the Assembly,³ should be "cautious and circumspect" to select men of "property, character, and abilities." These "have too much retired from public employment," since the end of

¹ *Maryland Journal*, January 8, 1788.

² *Maryland Journal*, February 1, 1788; *Maryland Gazette*, February 12.

³ *Gazette*, January 4, 1788.

the war, but it is hoped that they may now "step forth with a true patriotic ardor and snatch their dear country from the dreadful and devouring jaws of anarchy and ruin." The Federalists were urged to keep out of the list of delegates persons in desperate or embarrassed circumstances, advocates of paper-money, the truck bill, or the insolvent act, and those who may expect to escape in a general ruin of the country. "A Clergyman"¹ writes to the country people of Maryland, defending the Federal Convention, and showing that the outlook is gloomy, if this Constitution is not adopted, and that France and other nations may claim part of our soil, to pay the debt we owe them, if we remain without union.

Sometimes the writers were even inspired to burst forth into rhyme. A poem entitled "The Raising for Federal Mechanics" described the erection of the new building and ended thus:²

"Huzza, my brave Boys our work is complete,
The world shall admire Columbia's fair seat;
Its strength against Tempest and Time shall be proof,
And thousands shall come to dwell under our Roof;
Whilst we drain the deep Bowl, our Toast still shall be
Our Government firm and our Citizens Free."

The Anti-Federalists were no less rhythmical and call the new structure a composite temple.³

"All such important high pretensions
Weigh well, ye ensuing State Conventions,
Which should you find or just, or wise,
Smoothed o'er by no deceitful guise,
But wholesome, virtuous, and true,
From you they claim attention due.
But selfish should they prove, or vain,
Subverting concords sacred fane,
Diffusing anarchy and strife,
Those Baneful Pests of social life,
Reject the whole impious band,
Ere discord curse the guilty land."

Sorry enough doggerel it may be, but it shows the bent of men's minds. Luther Martin led the Anti-Federalist forces and followed the narrative of his interview in the legislature with a series of letters addressed to William Goddard, editor of the *Journal*, in answer to the popular series, written by Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut under the *nom de guerre* of "Land Holder."⁴ "Land Holder" answered some of these letters and Martin again replied. In the

¹ *Gazette*, February 12, 1788.

² *Gazette*, February 19, 1788.

³ Poem dated at Bladensburg in *Journal* for February 15. The *Gazette* for March 4 has another poem, The Federal Ship.

⁴ Reprinted in Ford, *Essays on the Constitution*, pp. 341, 344, 353, 360, 371, 378. *Md. Journal*, January 18, February 29, March 7, 18, 21, 28, April 14, 1788.

course of his letter, Martin attacks "Aristides" and says there is scarcely an individual of common understanding in Maryland, who knows the new Constitution, and "doth not allow it to be in many instances extremely censurable and that a variety of amendments and alterations are essential to render it consistent with a reasonable security for the liberty of the respective States and their citizens." He attacks "Aristides'" interpretation of the federal judiciary and says, if it is so complex that even "Aristides" does not understand it, is it not too intricate a system for common people? If the Constitution is accepted unamended, the new form of government will render the people "mere beasts of the burden" and reduce "you to a level with your own slaves, with this aggravating distinction, that you once tasted the blessings of freedom." There is danger that state rights and those of individuals be subverted and that the state governments be annihilated. The people are warned to "delegate no greater power than is clearly and certainly necessary. To whomsoever power is given, not content with the actual deposit, they will ever strive to obtain an increase. . . . I consider it an incontrovertible truth that whatever, by the Constitution, government ever may do, if it relates to the abuse of power by acts tyrannical and oppressive, it sometime or other will do. . . . Peaceably, quietly, and orderly to give this system of slavery your negative is all that is asked by the advocates of freedom."

With such startling language did the great lawyer seek to alarm the people,¹ but his ideas met with only a partial acceptance. "Sidney" wrote to the working people of Maryland² that "we common people are more properly citizens of America, than any particular State," and "Hamden" earnestly exhorted³ the people to adopt a "Constitution, superior perhaps to that of Great Britain," framed by an assembly of "so many eminent and learned personages, . . . men of candour, sense, and integrity, and also profound politicians." He especially defends the provisions concerning the executive⁴ and declares that the Convention seem to have copied the British Constitution "as much as the nature of a republican⁵ form of government and that of a limited monarchy would admit." "Paltry pirates annoy and harrass" our foreign trade and carry our citizens into slavery. Our public and private faith are coming to be regarded like those of the Carthaginians of old and yet this admirable

¹ "Grateful" attacks him with satire in *Baltimore Gazette*, February 15, 1788.

² *Journal*, February 29, 1788.

³ *Journal*, March 14, 1788.

⁴ Vide also *Gazette*, April 15.

⁵ *Gazette*, March 11, "Countryman" queries whether the Constitution will override state laws.

union is opposed by "desperate men, lost to love of country," such as the advocates of paper-money, the truck bill, and the insolvent act.

"Aristides" continues his support of the Constitution in occasional letters, in one of which he again states that he does not think the federal courts can entertain a suit brought by a citizen against a state. He is attacked by "Farmer"¹ and defended by "Plebeian." The latter complains that there is too little general interest in the coming convention and urges the voters to elect and instruct their representatives, using vigilance to "inquire, with the strictest scrutiny, into the sentiments and abilities of those who solicit our favor." No countenance should be given any miscreant, who would "bribe your integrity by the savage-like allurements of a few barbecued sacrifices." This allusion seems to show that there was an absence of other forms of bribery in the politics of the day. "Plebeian" defends the provision for a standing army, and the omission of a bill of rights, and maintains that history cannot show a "model better calculated to support the cause of freedom and at the same time, diffuse an authoritative energy through every part of the political machine."²

In addition to the objections of the Anti-Federalists which we have mentioned,³ they urged that the Senate would engross all powers of government and that Congress might make all Maryland ships enter at Georgetown and, therefore, the merchants would go to Norfolk, and Virginia would be benefitted at our expense. They also asserted that the postmaster-general had prohibited the sending of newspapers through the mails, that the people might not read Anti-Federal articles and that this prohibition was the first step in despotism.⁴ The next will be the bridling and throttling of the press. "Farmer" in his able articles insists that the majority of the people wish a union of independent states and sneers at the Federalists as imitators of England.⁵ He fears that trial by jury will be overturned by the federal government. Civil and religious liberty will be imperilled, aristocracy and even monarchy are to be feared; "Aristides" is wrong in the moderate view he holds of the power of the federal judiciary. "Neckar" supports "Farmer" and

¹ "Farmer" shows great knowledge of history and is particularly bitter on the standing army and the absence of a Bill of Rights. *Md. Journal*, March 4, 14, April 1. *Annapolis Gazette*, April 3, 1788. *Baltimore Gazette*, February 15, 29, March 4, 7.

² In *Gazette*, March 7 and April 4, 18. April 15 it reprints a letter by John Adams.

³ February 26, the *Gazette* has an article by "Caveto" against arbitrary power.

⁴ *Journal*, March 18, 1788, April 22.

⁵ *Gazette*, March 18, 21, 25, 28, April 1, 4, 11, 15, 22, 25. March 7, "Betsy Cornstalk," and 18, "Hints for a public print," are melancholy examples of would-be funny articles on the constitutional struggle. April 11, long article in Biblical style comparing the people to Israelites in the Wilderness.

vigorously maintains that "every stipulation should be previous to adoption."¹ New advocates for the constitution enter the field. "A Countryman" writes to the "Country people of Maryland" that the federal taxation will be through excises, and therefore will be no burden. It will be raised from imported luxuries rather than from the landed interest.² There is no danger of tyranny, but there is of anarchy, unless America becomes united. "Real Federalists" say that the men opposed to the Constitution are desperate and that the majority of the House, who voted for the truck bill, were needy men. Such men, especially the insolvent debtors, should not be chosen members of the convention, for a man in debt is a slave to his creditor and is liable to be bribed.³ Men of wealth, judges, senators and members of the Philadelphia Convention should be chosen.

We know little of the campaign in the counties. In Montgomery County John Mason of Virginia came over and made Anti-Federalist speeches in answer to Federalist ones made by William Dorsey, a lawyer.⁴ The vote of the county was three to one in favor of the Federal candidates.

In Anne Arundel County⁵ the powerful influence of the Carrolls and the Worthingtons was cast for ratification without amendment and no opposition appeared until a few days before the election. Then the opponents nominated Jeremiah T. Chase, John F. Mercer, who had been in the Federal Convention, and Benjamin Harrison. For a fourth candidate, they wished Governor Smallwood, but he was in Charles County and could not be reached in time. The name of Samuel Chase was then proposed, apparently without his knowledge. He came to Elkrige and Annapolis to speak against the Constitution. Through their vigorous efforts the Anti-Federalists carried the county. There was some criticism of Chase, who was still a member of the House of Delegates from the Federal town of Baltimore, for being chosen as an Anti-Federalist from one of the

¹ *Gazette*, March 25, April 11. "Insolvent" answers him sarcastically in *Journal* for April 1 and April 22 and attacks him for saying that the new government will not be responsible for the old debts.

² *Gazette*, March 4, April 4. "Tully" defends the Constitution, as does "Fabius" in April 22.

³ March 21, 1788, *Journal*. *Vide* also April 4, 25.

⁴ *Journal*, March 28, April 4.

⁵ *Journal*, April 18. April 1, "Farmer and Planter" writes long Anti-Federal articles saying that loss of liberty is threatened, that the rich are for the Constitution and have nominated the four richest men in Anne Arundel County. He grumbles about the excise, says that under the Constitution people may have to go to Georgia to vote for representatives and, if they refuse to pay the odious federal poll tax, the militia of Philadelphia, Boston, etc., may come and ravage the country.

counties.¹ His friends answered that he had never disclosed his sentiments, till he moved and carried in the House of Delegates the resolution to recommend the people to submit the proceedings of the Federal Convention to a state convention for their full and free investigation and decision. They maintained that the so-called Anti-Federalists were the true Federalists, and that the so-called Federalists were really Nationalists. One of the clergymen in the Baltimore presbytery had even gone so far as to say that "the sooner the state governments were abolished the better."

Washington County, in the extreme west of the state, was overwhelmingly Federal and "if there had been a respectable opposition," the Federal vote would have been more than doubled, "as the inhabitants were in readiness in the remotest parts," but the unanimity of the centre of the county rendered a larger Federal vote unnecessary.

Harford and Baltimore Counties each elected four Anti-Federalists. Every other county sent a solid Federal delegation. There were, therefore, only twelve Anti-Federalists in the convention, although some of the rest were in favor of compromises. It had been thought at first that the opposition would be larger and it was even rumored that twenty-five Anti-Federalists had been chosen.²

Concerning the campaign in Baltimore town, where two delegates were chosen, and Baltimore County, which sent four delegates, we have the fullest details. The Federalists were at work betimes. They urged the freemen of Baltimore town to choose two pledged men,³ preferably members of the Federal Convention. Conditional ratification is deprecated since this in fact "amounts to an entire rejection of the whole, because there is no provision made for taking up such a proposal or rendering it of any effect. . . . We, who are Federalists, should vote for and support with all our might two able upright Federalists, whom we know to be decidedly Federal, upon the most permanent and fixed principles." Underhand dealing must be guarded against and Baltimore must not be permitted to be the only seaport to disgrace a convention by Anti-Federal representatives. A little later, "Decided Federalist"⁴ complains of the supineness of Baltimore town and county. Probably

¹ *Gazette*, April 18, 22, 1788. Daniel Carroll writes to Madison, May 28, 1788, that Anne Arundel was supposed to be Federalist without opposition until four days before the election. Then J. T. Chase and Mercer signed and distributed a hand-bill which alarmed the people. Mercer made wild assertions such as that the French interest was with the promotion of the Federal Constitution and that the Philadelphia Convention wished trial by jury to be taken away. "Many repent their error."

² *Annapolis Gazette*, April 10, 1788.

³ *Journal*, February 19.

⁴ *Journal*, March 14, 1788.

not over one hundred will come in from the county to vote. It will be remembered that a man with property in both places had two votes. "A rich intriguing Anti-Federalist character" will send what delegates he pleases, by means of the numerous hands he employs and the inhabitants of the precincts, a knot always under his command. "Federalists should keep out all insolvents on the Black List. A certain man formerly attacked by the family most dipped in the Black List¹ now courts their interest. Let him declare for the Constitution and not be a trimmer. He is of extensive historical knowledge and general acquaintance throughout the continent." George Lux of Chatsworth answers this attack in a long letter, in which he states that he is the man "Decided Federalist" means.² He had been secretary to the foreign committee of Congress in 1777, when it met at Baltimore, and had proposed Annapolis as the permanent residence for Congress. Lux states that in the beginning a dozen freeholders, who favored the republican principle that one office was enough for any man, met and nominated John Cradock, Capt. Charles Ridgely of Wm., and George Lux.³ For the fourth place Benjamin Nicholson or Thomas Jones was suggested. Lux opposed their nomination, as they were judges, and therefore interested in opposing any abridgment of state governments, though necessary to the Union. They finally agreed on Aquila Hall, as a lawyer who could judge of the advisability of adopting the article concerning the federal judiciary. Hall removed to Harford County, so James Gittings was nominated. Lux had not yielded to the influence of the Ridgelys, but wanted impartial representation and unpledged delegates. The ticket was so selected as to represent all parts of the county, geographically. Capt. Ridgely was against the Constitution. Lux said he wished for union and thought the good parts of the Constitution outweighed the bad ones. The compromise as to representation in Congress was a most "masterly one" of contending interests. At some future time, Lux wishes another general convention, but not now, because of the discordant views of the opposition. Another group of voters had nominated Harry Dorsey Gough, a pronounced Federalist, a non-juror during the war on account of his religious opinions, and an assembly-man,⁴ Thomas

¹ The Ridgelys.

² *Journal*, March 25, 1788.

³ In the *Gazette* for February 8, "A Farmer" says Lux, Cradock, and Ridgely of Wm. are too young to go to the convention. It were better to choose Deye, Charles Ridgely and two others about fifty years old. February 12, "A Marylander" tries to be impartial, says that Luther Martin goes too far, that no assembly-men should be elected to the convention and that Deye does not want election and should not be voted for.

⁴ Lux says he was "too long estranged from public affairs and a party man."

Cockey Deye, and Charles Ridgely, cousin of the Captain. As election drew near,¹ the candidates realigned themselves, and Gough, Cradock, Gittings, and Lux appealed to the Federal voters. Lux objected to be pledged, saying a "six years old child can lisp yes," and so his name was withdrawn and that of John Eager Howard substituted. Deye also withdrew and the two Ridgelys with Col. Edward Cockey and Nathan Cromwell were the Anti-Federal candidates.

It was asserted at first, that the Federalists were elected,² but the final returns gave the Anti-Federalists a majority. On the face of the returns, Gough received 787, Cradock 774, Gittings 773, and Howard 771; while Charles Ridgely had only 682, Charles Ridgely of Wm. 678, Edward Cockey 645, and Nathan Cromwell 630. It was charged that at Dewitt's House, where there was a poll,³ town men, some of them "apprentice boys, servants and slaves having no property in the world," voted Federal tickets, and the sheriff declared the Anti-Federalists elected by great majorities. On this election there is an interesting and curious article by "Solon" in the *Baltimore Gazette*.⁴ He maintains that, with respect to the new Constitution, the people are in a state of nature, that the Constitution is adopted by "the people of the United States" and, therefore, Maryland's legislature has no right to dictate the method of election of delegates. A man should be allowed to vote for delegates to the state convention at the place where he happened to be on election day.

In Baltimore town,⁵ the Federal victory was decisive. James McHenry, who had been in the Philadelphia Convention, and Dr. John Coulter were nominated by that party. The Federalists said there was "never greater unanimity" than in the election; McHenry and Coulter were not nominated until the second day of the election, but they obtained "the general suffrages of their fellow-citizens," because the people were "of the opinion that the ratification of the Constitution ought to precede any amendments and that it would be injurious to our common interests, to delay its ratification in the hope of obtaining them in any other manner than prescribed by the Constitution."⁶ After the election, a procession

¹ *Journal*, April 4, 1788.

² *Gazette*, April 11, 1788.

³ Held by a coroner and two justices of the peace. Legality of it attacked forcibly by "Casca" in *Gazette* of April 18. On negroes voting see letter by J. V. L. McMahon in *Baltimore Sun* for January 21, 1867.

⁴ April 15, 1788; *vide* also the issue of April 25.

⁵ *Gazette*, April 18, 25. "Publius to the great Majority of the Voters of Baltimore Town" writes Federal articles and attacks Chase.

⁶ *Gazette*, April 11.

said to number one thousand people paraded through the town, preceded by the United States flag and a small decorated ship, the *Federalist*.¹ "Such was the mildness of our clime that during her whole voyage," writes the reporter, "she met not a single anti-federalist blast to ruffle her sails." In the procession were ship-builders, tradesmen, merchants and manufacturers.

The Anti-Federalists maintained that the commissioners permitted all freemen over twenty-one years of age to vote,² so that votes were cast by men who had not been a week in the town and by others who were not naturalized Americans, but were subjects of Great Britain and Ireland, France and Holland. They charged that there were other irregularities. The commissioners took no oath as judges of election, and adjourned the election when they desired. On Wednesday of the election, which lasted three days, many men, including foreign sailors and servants armed with bludgeons, took possession of the polls and prevented peaceable German citizens from voting. It was admitted that over 250 illegal votes were cast for Mr. Sterrett, Anti-Federalist candidate; but for McHenry, the Anti-Federalists asserted, nearly 800 fraudulent votes were polled. No contest, however, was made in the convention.

BERNARD C. STEINER.

(*To be continued.*)

MEMBERS OF THE CONVENTION OF MARYLAND WHICH RATIFIED THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION, APRIL 21-29, 1788.³

<i>Members.</i>			<i>Opponents.</i>
ANNAPOLIS CITY.			
Judge Alexander Contee Hanson, Fed.			Unknown.
<i>Nicholas Carroll,</i>	"		
ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY.			
Jeremiah Townley Chase,	Anti-Fed.	Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Fed.	
Samuel Chase (came Apr. 24),	"	James Carroll,	"
John Francis Mercer,	"	Brice Worthington,	"
Benjamin Harrison,	"	John Hall,	"
BALTIMORE COUNTY.			
	<i>Vote.</i>		<i>Vote.</i>
Edward Cockey (came April 24), Anti-Fed.,	639	Harry Dorsey Gough, Fed.,	192
Nathan Cromwell (came April 24), "	629	James Gittings,	" 183
Charles Ridgely (came April 22), "	676	John Eager Howard,	" 172
Charles Ridgely of William ("), "	673	John Cradock,	" 171

¹ *Journal*, April 11.

² *Gazette*, April 15, 22. The claim was made that there were 1047 legal voters in the town, of which number 671 did not vote while 1053 illegal votes were cast.

³ From the *Maryland Journal* of April 11, 15 and 18, 1788. Those whose names are printed in italics voted with the Anti-Federalists on the final vote to adjourn. An article in the *Baltimore Gazette* for May 9 states that only three gentlemen were chosen out of the county of their residence.

BALTIMORE TOWN.

	<i>Vote.</i>		<i>Vote.</i>
James McHenry (came April 22), Fed.,	962	Samuel Sterrett, Anti-Fed.,	385
John Coulter (came April 22), " 958		David McMechen, "	380

CALVERT COUNTY.

<i>James Wilkinson</i> , Fed.	Unknown.
Walter Smith, "	
<i>Charles Graham</i> , "	
John Chesley, Jr., "	

CAROLINE COUNTY.

<i>Col. Wm. Richardson</i> (came April 22), Fed.	Unkuonw.
Major Joseph Richardson (came April 22), "	
<i>Matthew Driver</i> (came April 22), "	
Peter Edmondson (came April 22), "	

CECIL COUNTY.

Joseph Gilpin, Fed.	Unknown.
Henry Hollingsworth, "	
Samuel Evans, "	
James Gordon Heron, "	

CHARLES COUNTY.

Gustavus Richard Brown, Fed.	Unknown.
<i>John Parnham</i> , "	
Zephaniah Turner, "	
Michael Jenifer Stone, "	

DORCHESTER COUNTY.

Robert Goldsborough, Sr., (absent.) ¹ Fed.	Unknown.
<i>Nicholas Hammond</i> , "	
Daniel Sullivane, "	
James Shaw, "	

FREDERICK COUNTY.

Thomas Sim Lee (came April 22), Fed.	No opposition; county almost unanimously
<i>Thomas Johnson</i> , "	Federalist.
Richard Potts (came April 22), "	
Abraham Law, "	

HARFORD COUNTY.

William Paca (came April 24), Anti-Fed.	Unknown.
Luther Martin (came April 24), "	
John Love (came April 24), "	
William Pinkney (came April 23), "	

KENT COUNTY.

William Tilghman, Fed.	Unknown.
Donaldson Yates, "	
<i>Isaac Perkins</i> , "	
William Granger, "	

MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

	<i>Vote.</i>		<i>Vote.</i>
Thomas Cramphin (came April 24), Fed.,	896	Edward Burgess, Anti-Fed.,	313
Richard Thomas, "	895	Lawrence O'Neal, "	312
William Deakins, Jr., "	894	William Holmes, "	312
Benjamin Edwards, "	891	Henry Griffith, "	311

¹ Daniel Carroll writes Madison, April 28, that he was sick.

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY.

George Digges,	Fed.	Unknown.
Osborne Sprigg,	"	
Benjamin Hall,	"	
<i>Fielder Bowie,</i>	"	

QUEEN ANNE'S COUNTY.

James Tilghman, 3rd. (came April 22),	Fed.	Unknown.
John Seney (came April 22),	"	
James Holliday (came April 22),	"	
William Hemsley (came April 24),	"	

ST. MARY'S COUNTY.

George Plater,	Fed.	Unknown.
Col. Richard Barnes,	"	
Nicholas Lewis Sewall,	"	
Charles Chilton,	"	

SOMERSET COUNTY.

George Gale (came April 22),	Fed.	Unknown.
Col. John Stewart (came April 22),	"	
Henry Waggaman (came April 22),	"	
Major John Gale (came April 22),	"	

TALBOT COUNTY.

Jeremiah Baining (absent), ¹	Fed.	Unknown.
<i>Col. Edward Lloyd</i> (came April 22),	"	
Robert Goldsborough, Jr. (came April 24),	"	
John Stevens (came April 22),	"	

WASHINGTON COUNTY.

	<i>Vote.</i>		<i>Vote.</i>
Col. Thomas Sprigg, Fed.,	657	Jacob Cellers, Anti-Fed.,	25
John Stull,	" "	Jacob Funk,	24
Moses Rawlings,	" "	Col. Andrew Bruce,	21
Henry Shryock,	" "	Col. Norman Bruce,	14

WORCESTER COUNTY.

<i>Peter Chaille,</i>	Fed.	Unknown.
<i>John Done,</i>	"	
<i>William Morris,</i>	"	
<i>James Martin,</i>	"	

¹ Daniel Carroll writes James Madison April 28, that he was sick.